

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed electronically with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the below date:

Date: May 24, 2007 Name: Jasper W. Dockrey Signature: /Jasper W. Dockrey/

**BRINKS
HOFFER
GILSON
& LIONE**

Case No. 9905/18
EP/FM BIF023240/US

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)
Jean-Charles Souriau)
Serial No.: 10/731,382) Examiner:
Filing Date: December 8, 2003) Dinh D. Chiem
For: OPTICAL ARRANGEMENT WITH)
TWO OPTICAL INPUTS/OUTPUTS AND) Group Art Unit:
PRODUCTION METHODS) 2883
Confirmation No.: 4537

Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL

Sir:

Attached is/are:

☒ Renewed Request for Reconsideration and Withdrawal of Final Office Action

Fee calculation:

- ☐ An extension fee in an amount of \$_____ for a _____-month extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).
☐ A petition or processing fee in an amount of \$_____ under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(_____).

Fee payment:

- ☐ Please charge Deposit Account No. 23-1925 in the amount of \$_____. A copy of this Transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.
☒ The Director is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional filing fees required under 37 CFR § 1.16 and any patent application processing fees under 37 CFR § 1.17 associated with this paper (including any extension fee required to ensure that this paper is timely filed), or to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 23-1925.

Respectfully submitted,

May 24, 2007
Date

/Jasper W. Dockrey/
Jasper W. Dockrey (Reg. No. 33,868)

BRINKS HOFFER GILSON & LIONE
NBC Tower – Suite 3600, 455 N. Cityfront Plaza Drive, Chicago, IL 60611-5599

**BRINKS
HOFFER
GILSON
& LIONE**

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed electronically with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the below date:

Date: May 24, 2007 Name: Jasper W. Dockrey Signature: /Jasper W. Dockrey/

Case No. 9905/18
EP/FM BIF023240/US

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)	
)	
Jean-Charles Souriau)	
)	Examiner:
Serial No.: 10/731,382)	Dinh D. Chiem
)	
Filing Date: December 8, 2003)	Group Art Unit:
)	2883
For: OPTICAL ARRANGEMENT WITH)	
TWO OPTICAL INPUTS/OUTPUTS AND)	
PRODUCTION METHODS)	Confirmation No.: 4537
)	

Renewed Request For Reconsideration And Withdrawal Of Final Office Action

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In the Advisory Action of May 15, 2007, the Examiner stated that "the limitation 'at least partially optical component' changed the scope of the invention since prior to the amendment the examiner considers the 'component' to be only optical." The applicants assert that the Examiner is mistaken regarding the contents of the applicants' claim. Claim 1 as submitted with the applicants' response of December 7, 2006 is reproduced below.

1. (Currently amended) An optical arrangement comprising two parallel plates each with a through-hole ~~forming~~ defining an optical input/output ~~with a given~~ having an optical axis and an **at least partly optical component** ~~placed~~ between the plates, the at least partly optical component and a first plate of the two parallel plates comprising first fastening studs placed transversely opposite the first plate and connected by first bumps ~~made of~~ comprising a meltable

material that when molten is able configured to selectively wet ~~these~~ the first fastening studs ~~in order to~~ optically align the at least partly optical component and the optical input/output of the first plate, and wherein the two parallel plates ~~comprising further comprise~~ second fastening studs placed transversely opposite the plate two parallel plates and connected by second bumps ~~made of comprising~~ a meltable material that when molten is able configured to selectively wet the second fastening studs ~~in order to~~ optically align the optical input/output ~~inputs/outputs~~ on the two parallel plates. (Claim 1 emphasis added)

The first instance of the claim term "at least partly optical component" is shown above in boldface print. This claim term already existed in claim 1 at the time that the applicants filed there response of December 7, 2006. The underlined term was added in the response only to preserve proper antecedent basis in the claim. This addition does not represent any change to the scope of the claim, as asserted by the Examiner in the Advisory Action of May 15, 2007.

The applicants again request reconsideration and withdrawal of the final rejection set forth in the Office Action of March 23, 2007. The finality of the Office Action is grounded on the assertion that the applicants' amendment of their claims in their response of December 7, 2006 justifies the final rejection. The applicants reiterate their assertion that, in their response of December 7, 2006, they amended their claims only to address matters of form. These amendments did not substantively alter the scope of their claims. The MPEP instructs Examiners to anticipate amendments to address matters of form and that such amendments do not support issuance of a final office action. MPEP 706.07(a).

Respectfully submitted,

/Jasper W. Dockrey/
Jasper W. Dockrey
Registration No. 33,868
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200